



Atty. Dkt. G-41

#12AF  
T.D.  
10/23/01  
2700

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : Herve Orsus and Jean-Jacques Foglin  
Serial No. : 09/202,424  
Confirmation No:  
Examiner : Mark Tremblay  
Filed : 12/10/98  
GAU : 2165  
For : SECURITY PROCEDURE FOR CONTROLLING THE  
TRANSFER OF VALUE UNITS IN A CHIP CARD  
GAMING SYSTEM

Technology Center 2100

OCT 22 2001

RECEIVED

AMENDMENT *pc*

OCT 15 2001

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

This is in response to the October 4, 2001 Advisory Action (Paper No. 10), that was in response to the September 28, 2001 amendment, filed in response to the May 21, 2001 Office Action FINAL (Paper No. ).

There are three independent claims in this application, 1, 26 and 36.

In the September 28, 2001 Amendment After FINAL, dependent claim 27 was inserted into its independent claim 26. Claims 26 and 27 have been in the application for at least the two previous amendments. Thus, there was no new matter introduced into the combined claims 26 and 27.

The feature of claim 27 was added to claim 26 to make the claim more explicit and to expedite the prosecution. There are no new issues at all.

In the October 4, 2001 Advisory Action, the examiner advised under ¶1. NOTE: "Rewriting claim 26 to include 27

Amendment D  
Ser. No.: 09/202,424  
Page 2

changes [dependent] claims 28-35 in a way that would require further consideration."

But, nothing is said about the refusal to allow claim 26 combined with 27. This does not raise a new issue.

There is a single applied reference, namely, Raven. It does not show or suggest the features of combined claims 26 and 27; nor does it show the features of the claims dependent on either claim 26 without claim 27, or the combined claims 26 and 27.

The Advisory Action is silent on the remaining two independent claims, namely, claims 1 and 36. Also, of the claims that are dependent from claims 1 and 36.

At the interview with the examiner on September 20, 2001, it was applicant's attorney's understanding from the interview that there was insistence there were new issues in the claims in the amendment immediately preceding the FINAL. However, there were no changes in those claims. Thus, there were no new issues. At the interview, a request was specifically made for withdrawal of the May 21, 2001 FINAL because it was premature.

In summary, the Office is respectfully requested to review the Office Action FINAL, the previous and subsequent responses; and then, based on the record in the file, to

Amendment D  
Ser. No.: 09/202,424  
Page 3

reconsider possible allowability of the claims, especially claims 26 and 27 combined and independent claim 36 and their entire set of dependent claims. It is repeated that it is believed that the reference neither shows nor suggests these claims.

The second request for reconsideration is to withdraw the May 21, 2001 FINAL as premature. The FINAL was not based on claims substantively changed but on claims that had remained in the file throughout the prior to FINAL amendment. That, coupled with the lack of pertinence of the single applied reference, is the further reason for withdrawal of the FINAL.

Respectfully submitted,

Roland Plottel

Roland Plottel  
PTO 20,707

212 489-7073  
Roland Plottel  
Rockefeller Center Stn.  
P.O. Box 293  
New York, NY 10185

Certificate under 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States postal service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on OCT 15 2001

Roland Plottel  
Roland Plottel  
PTO 20707